REMARKS

In response to the Notice of Non-responsive Amendment, Claims 1-3, 5, 49, 51-65, 67-80 and 82-92 and withdrawn Claims 52, 53, 58, 67, 68, 73, 82, 83, 88 and 89 have been reinstated, and Claims 93-106 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the cancellation of Claims 93-106, and further in view of the amendments and remarks herein, the present amendment is responsive to the April 23, 2009 Notice of Non-responsive Amendment and the October 1, 2007 Office Action.

Claims 1-3, 5, 49, 51, 54-57, 60-65, 69-72, 75-80 and 84-92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,546,405 to Gupta et al. (hereinafter "Gupta") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0107439 to Hassell et al. (hereinafter Hassell).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

1.   (Currently amended) A method for displaying a message indicator in association with a predetermined interval of playback of an audiovisual production, the method comprising:
playing back the audiovisual production in a first screen display size;
displaying the message indicator substantially during the predetermined interval of playback of the audiovisual production;
determining that a user has selected the message indicator while the message indicator is displayed;
automatically resizing the first screen display size to be a second screen display size that is smaller than the first screen display size, the second screen display size including the playback of the audiovisual production;
providing a text window, wherein at least a portion of the text window is included in a portion of space previously occupied by the first screen display size;
displaying at least a portion of the message in response to the user selection of the message indicator in the text window, wherein the message is included in a thread of a plurality of messages;
displaying at least a portion of one or more of the plurality of messages in the thread in response to determining that the user has selected the message indicator;
providing an interface via which ratings for respective of the plurality of messages in the thread can be selected; and
providing an interface via which filtering and/or sorting of the plurality of messages can be selected based at least in part on associated ratings.

The combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest multiple features of Claim 1, as well as the combination of features recited in Claim 1. For example, neither Gupta nor Hassell mention rating a message, much less rating a message in a thread. Therefore, the combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest the feature: "providing an interface via which ratings for respective of the plurality of messages in the thread can be selected."

Still further, neither Gupta nor Hassell mention enabling a user to sort or filter messages in a thread, much less sort filter messages in a thread based at least in part on associated ratings. Therefore, the combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest the feature: "providing an interface via which filtering and/or sorting of the plurality of messages can be selected based at least in part on associated ratings".

In addition to the lack of teaching of each of the above-recited features of Claim 1, the combination of Gupta and Hassell also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1 and any claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 60

Claim 60 recites:

An apparatus configured to display a message indicator in association with a predetermined interval of playback of an audiovisual production, the apparatus comprising:
one or more processors; and
a memory containing instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to perform a method comprising:
playing back the audiovisual production in a first screen display size;
displaying the message indicator substantially during the predetermined interval of playback of the audiovisual production;
determining that a user has selected the message indicator while the message indicator is displayed;
automatically resizing the first screen display size to be a second screen display size that is smaller than the first screen display size, the second screen display size including the playback of the audiovisual production;
providing a text window, wherein at least a portion of the text window is included in a portion of space previously occupied by the first screen display size;

        displaying at least a portion of the message in response to the user selection of the message indicator in the text window, wherein the message is included in a thread of a plurality of messages;

        displaying at least a portion of one or more of the plurality of messages in the thread in response to determining that the user has selected the message indicator;

        generating an interface via which ratings for respective of the plurality of messages in the thread can be selected; and

        generating an interface via which filtering and/or sorting of the plurality of messages can be selected based at least in part on associated ratings.

The combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest multiple features of Claim 60, as well as the combination of features recited in Claim 60. For example, neither Gupta nor Hassell mention rating a message, much less rating a message in a thread. Therefore, the combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest the feature: "generating an interface via which ratings for respective of the plurality of messages in the thread can be selected."

Still further, neither Gupta nor Hassell mention enabling a user to sort or filter messages in a thread, much less sort filter messages in a thread based at least in part on associated ratings. Therefore, the combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest the feature: "generating an interface via which filtering and/or sorting of the plurality of messages can be selected based at least in part on associated ratings."

In addition to the lack of teaching of each of the above-recited features of Claim 60, the combination of Gupta and Hassell also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 60. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 60 and any claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 75

Claim 75 recites:

        A tangible computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions stored thereon that, if executed by a computing device, cause the computing device to perform a method comprising:

        playing back an audiovisual production in a first screen display size;

        displaying a message indicator in association with a predetermined interval of playback of the audiovisual production substantially during the predetermined interval of playback of the audiovisual production;

> determining that a user has selected the message indicator while the message indicator is displayed;
>
> automatically resizing the first screen display size to be a second screen display size that is smaller than the first screen display size, the second screen display size including the playback of the audiovisual production;
>
> providing a text window, wherein at least a portion of the text window is included in a portion of space previously occupied by the first screen display size;
>
> displaying at least a portion of the message in response to the user selection of the message indicator in the text window, wherein the message is included in a thread of a plurality of messages;
>
> displaying at least a portion of one or more of the plurality of messages in the thread in response to determining that the user has selected the message indicator;
>
> generating an interface via which ratings for one or more of the plurality of messages in the thread can be submitted; and
>
> generating an interface via which filtering and/or sorting of the plurality of messages based at least in part on associated rating may be selected.

The combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest multiple features of Claim 75, as well as the combination of features recited in Claim 75. For example, neither Gupta nor Hassell mention rating a message, much less rating a message in a thread. Therefore, the combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest the feature: "generating an interface via which ratings for one or more of the plurality of messages in the thread can be submitted."

Still further, neither Gupta nor Hassell mention enabling a user to sort or filter messages in a thread, much less sort filter messages in a thread based at least in part on associated ratings. Therefore, the combination of Gupta and Hassell fails to teach or suggest the feature: "generating an interface via which filtering and/or sorting of the plurality of messages based at least in part on associated rating may be selected".

In addition to the lack of teaching of each of the above-recited features of Claim 75, the combination of Gupta and Hassell also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in Claim 75. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 75 and any claims that depend therefrom.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

-14-

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: August 21, 2009

By:/Russell M. Jeide/_____
    Russell M. Jeide
    Registration No. 54,198
    Attorney of Record
    Customer No. 20995
    (951) 781-9231

7637006
081209